

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 18, 26, 27, 29 and 32-35 are pending in this application and have been finally rejected.

In particular, claims 29, 32 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Artemi U.S. Patent No. 5,584,455. Claim 27 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Artemi in view of Hall. Claims 18, 33 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Artemi in view of Adkins. Claim 26 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Artemi in view of Adkins and further in view of Hall.

Applicant has reviewed the Examiner's citation of the art and the pending claims. In particular, Applicant notes that each of the independent claims recites that there is a vertical plane of the hook-shaped member that passes through a center of said extended hook region surface, the center of said body portion surface and the center of said rod retaining surface. Further, each of the independent claims recites that the extended hook region surface is convexly shaped in a direction orthogonal to said vertical plane and wherein the body portion surface is convexly shaped in the direction orthogonal to the vertical plane.

The Examiner has not focused on these recitations of the claims in rejecting the claims based upon Artemi and the other prior art references cited and applied. By having a convexly shaped curved surface in a direction orthogonal to the vertical plane, i.e., orthogonal to the plane of the device, the device for holding garment hangers can be more easily removed from the rod by tilting the device at an angle to the rod. This causes slightly more clearance than when the garment hanging device is orthogonal to the rod. This is described in paragraphs 21-23 of the application. In particular, at the end of paragraph 21 it is recited that "convexly curved surfaces on hook resistance portions 22, 26 permit device 15 to be removed at a skewed angle with respect to rod 11 while maintaining a measure of resistance to removal." This is discussed with reference to Fig. 7A and 7B.

As shown in Fig. 7B, the surfaces 22 and 26 are convexly shaped in the direction orthogonal to the vertical plane of the device. This allows the hanger 15 to be tilted with respect to the rod thereby to provide slightly more clearance to enable easier removal of the device 15 from the rod. Coupled with the manufacture of the device out of a plastic material, with its

inherent flexibility, the claimed feature, allows the garment hanger device to be easily removed from the rod yet retaining a resistance fit on the rod.

None of the cited references taken alone or in combination teach or support this. Artemi is silent on the feature of convexity in the direction orthogonal to the plane of the device. Hall clearly does not disclose convexity in a direction orthogonal to the plane of each of the clips G and H. Adkins, showing a clip for a ski pole, also does not show such convexity in a direction orthogonal to the plane of his clip. See Figs. 1, 2 and 4 of Adkins.

The Examiner previously cited the Oatley reference 70,884 for this teaching. The Oatley reference has not been applied in the current rejection of the claims. However, the Oatley hook is made of metal, which is a rigid material, and Oatley's rod A is of much smaller diameter than the opening between the hook and the body portion of the hook and accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion in the Oatley reference of (a) making the hook of plastic and (b) providing a resistance fit of the hook to the shaft, and accordingly, Applicant submits it would not be obvious to take the unrelated teaching of Oatley related to convexity in a direction orthogonal to the vertical plane of the device and apply it to Artemi or Adkins which show plastic hooks.


Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims and submits that the claims should be allowed in view of this showing.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that all claims in this application are now in condition for allowance, prompt notification of which is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING
SYSTEM ON October 5, 2007.

LCD/jh



Louis C. Dujmich
Registration No.: 30,625
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700